

INDO-POLISH LIBRARY

**SOCIALISTS
AND THE
POLISH CAUSE**

CONTRIBUTORS :

**M. R. MASANI, PHILIP MURRAY
ROBERT WATT, DAVID DUBINSKY**

AUNDH PUBLISHING TRUST

*Copyright
First Published November 1944*

SOLE DISTRIBUTORS FOR INDIA:

PADMA PUBLICATIONS LTD
SIR PHIROZSHAH MEHTA ROAD,
BOMBAY

Printed by V. R. Sawant at the Associated Advertisers & Printers Ltd., 505, Arthur Road, Tardeo, Bombay 7, and Published by Maurice Frydman for the Aundh Publishing Trust, Swatantrapur, Aundh State.

An Indian Socialist's View Of Poland

by M. R. Masani

On September 1, 1939, German troops invaded Poland. The proximate cause was the Polish refusal to cede Danzig and the Corridor. A more fundamental cause was the refusal of Poland in January, 1939, to join in alliance with Germany, despite an offer of territorial compensation, in preparation for a joint attack on Russia.

On September 3, England and France, which had encouraged Poland to resist the German demands, declared war on Germany. Anyone who had then forecast a British victory or a German defeat without the restoration of Polish independence would have been certified a lunatic.

Five years have now passed and the lunacy is on the point of consummation. If with the impending fall of Warsaw to the Russian army, a new occupation and subjugation of Poland commences it will be one of the most tragic features of a tragically futile war. It will also be a portent of the shape of things to come in Europe generally and elsewhere.

THE STAB IN THE BACK

What has transpired during the last five years makes an incredibly bizarre story. On September 17, while the Polish armies were single-handedly resisting the German Wehrmacht, while Warsaw was still in

Polish hands, the Russians attacked Poland from the East. It was a stab in the back by arrangement with the Germans. There is little doubt that the partition of Poland was one of the secret clauses of the Stalin-Hitler Pact of August, 1939, by which Stalin showed Hitler the green light to let war loose on the world. Faced with this dual assault, Polish resistance collapsed. On October 31, 1939, Molotov told the Supreme Council of the Soviets: "Poland has ceased to exist and never more shall return to independence."

A reign of terror started under German occupation in Western Poland. Different in method from that in Western Poland but no less harrowing in its results was the treatment by the Russian Government of Eastern Poland. In defiance of the Hague Convention of 1907, elections were organised at the point of the bayonet. Voting was made compulsory and there was only one party list for which a voter could vote. With a tradition lasting centuries of resistance to foreign rule, the Poles continued to resist, with the result that no less than two million people were deported from Eastern Poland to places in Siberia and Asiatic Russia. Among these were socialists and trade unionists as well as landlords and professional men.

Some of these, like the internationally-known socialist leaders Henrick Ehrlich and Victor Alter, were "liquidated" by the Russian Government despite appeals and protests by the entire international socialist movement and by such friends of the Soviet Union as Professor Harold Laski, Mr. Wendell Willkie, Professor Einstein, Mr. Phillip Murray, President of the C. I. O. and Mr. William Green, President of the American Federation of Labour.

When in 1941 Hitler turned on his ally and Russia was fighting with its back to the wall, the Russian Government entered into an alliance with Britain and with Poland by which "the Government of the U.S.S.R. recognised the German-Soviet treaties of 1939, as to the territorial changes in Poland, as having lost their validity." Mr Eden declared that "Britain does not recognise any territorial changes brought about in Poland since August, 1939." It was during this period that a few thousands of the more fortunate Poles were allowed to leave Russia for the Middle East, but more than a million remained in captivity in Siberia.

When, however, the tide of war turned and the German attack on Russia was beaten back, Russian policy underwent yet another change.

"The devil was ill, the devil a saint would be
The devil was well, the devil a devil was he"

GOING BACK ON PLEDGE

At first subtly and then openly, the Russian Government went back on its pledge to respect Polish independence and integrity. In February 1943 Korneitchuk, a high official of the Russian Foreign Office and now Foreign Commissar of the 'Autonomous' Ukrainian Republic, claimed for the first time that the territory invaded by the Russians in 1939 belonged to Russia and not to Poland. The territory in question constitutes about 51 per cent of Polish soil. When the Polish Government refused to agree to another partition of Poland, the Russian Government, making a grievance of the reasonable request for investigation by the International Red Cross into the alleged

murder of ten thousand Polish officers at Katyn, broke off diplomatic relations with the Polish Government.

Then started a campaign of falsification of facts and vilification of the Polish Government as 'Fascist' in the manner so exquisitely developed in Moscow in the past decade. The ridiculous nature of this charge is made evident by a glance at the composition of the present Polish Cabinet. The Prime Minister and two others represent the Peasant Party. There are three Socialist Ministers representing the Polish Socialist Party, one of them being Deputy Prime Minister. Two other members represent the Christian Labour Party and two are National Democrats (Conservatives). The remaining three members of this coalition do not belong to any particular party.

THE MOSCOW UNION

The next step was the formation of a 'Union of Polish Patriots' in Moscow. The only member of this Union whose name was at all heard of till then was Wanda Wasilevska, a novelist, who had some years ago left Poland, had accepted Russian citizenship and was made a colonel in the Red Army as a reward for her polemical activities. Last year, a story of hers was awarded the Stalin Prize for 1943. According to *Time* magazine, "the Stalin Prize Novel is possibly one of the worst novels ever written". The most comic part of this tragic-comic opera is that this leader of the Polish 'Patriots' is the wife of Korneitchuk, the Foreign Commissar of the 'Autonomous' Ukrainian Republic. Nobody can after this accuse Stalin of lacking a sense of humour.

This puppet show in Moscow has had its title successively changed as events developed. On July

23, 1944, Moscow Radio broadcast the following delightfully comic announcement : "On behalf of the Union of Polish Patriots, it is declared that the Polish National Council has announced the formation of the Polish Committee of National Liberation."

The depths of cynicism were touched, however, when a decree of the Supreme Soviets was published in Moscow conferring Polish citizenship on Russians who were helping the Polish 'Patriots' to 'liberate' Poland from the Germans. It is the first case in the history of international law of one State purporting to confer on its own nationals the citizenship of another State.

All this is reminiscent of the farce (since abandoned) of the "Finnish People's Government" set up under Kussinen at Terijoki at the start of the Russian attack on Finland. This time, however, the farce threatens to result in grim tragedy for the Polish people.

WARSAW

The martyrdom of Warsaw is the ugliest chapter in this tragic tale. For months now, the Russian army has been barely 25 miles from Warsaw.

In July 1944, the Moscow Radio broadcast in the Polish language repeated appeals from the "Polish Patriots" to the Poles in Warsaw to rise. Here are just two of the many such incitements. On July 15th Moscow broadcast : "The will to fight has grown in the Polish Home Army. It is generally believed that it is time to act. There is great discontent with the orders of Sosnkowski and Bor to wait."

On July 30th, the call to arms was categorically given : "The Soviet armies are pushing forward and

are nearing Praga. They come to bring you liberation. People of Warsaw, to arms ! The whole population should gather round the Home Army. Attack the Germans ! Assist the Red Army to cross the Vistula !”

Two days later, on 1st August, the Polish Underground Army responded to this appeal by coming out into the open under General Bor and capturing large parts of the city from the Germans. But for some reason, the Russian army across the Vistula moved not a muscle to help the Poles. Polish planes and airmen were flown by the Western Powers to drop supplies in Warsaw from as far away as Italy. But still the Russians refused to help. They now put out the audacious lie that the rising was “unauthorised”. What other explanation of this amazing behaviour can there be than that Stalin wanted the Polish army to be destroyed by the Germans so that later on the way might be cleared for his puppet “Polish” Government to be set up in Warsaw without opposition ? This sickening technique succeeded when on 2nd October Warsaw fell to the Germans a second time—again with Russian connivance.

On May 12, 1917, at a Conference of the Social Democratic (Bolshevik) Party, Lenin had said : “No one has oppressed the Poles as much as have the Russian people, serving in the hands of Tsars as the executioners of Polish freedom. Why should we, who have been oppressing a greater number of nations than any other people, repudiate the right of separation for Poland, Finland and the Ukraine ?” And later it was specifically laid down in the Treaty of Riga : “Russia and Ukraine abandon all rights and claims to the territories situated to the west of the frontier.”

TRAGIC CONTRAST

What a tragic contrast to these noble words of Lenin do present-day Russian policies present! Every other day the realities of that policy are becoming clearer. One day it may be the recognition of Badoglio; another day it may be the recognition of the British Empire as 'a very useful organisation not only to its members, but also to other United Nations', and yet another day it may be the rejection of plans for world security based on the equality of nations and the assertion of the right of the Big Three to dictate to the world.

With puppets in every European country—a Tito in Yugoslavia, and a Wasilevska in Poland,—Stalin hopes to dominate Europe. Soon, Russian imperialism will also menace Asiatic countries like Iran and China. Britain went to war to stop Hitler becoming master of Europe, she is now witnessing helplessly Stalin taking his place. It is a situation rich in historic irony, but this is cold consolation to a valiant people who once again see their country in danger of foreign occupation. For centuries, the Poles have fought Russians, Germans and Austrians to keep their country united and free. There is little doubt they will do so again.

There are only two alternatives that face them. One is for their Government, in an effort to save face, to eat the humble pie and to capitulate to the Russians, to be given a place in a puppet Government. The other way is to resist, to keep the flag of national freedom flying,—underground if need be, in exile if need be. Either way, for some years to come, it is the end of a free Poland.

And so, let us INDIANS extend our arms across the vast spaces that separate us to welcome the Polish people to the fraternity of those subject nations who know no surrender to oppression and no acceptance of a foreign yoke.

AMERICAN WORKERS' MESSAGES TO FIGHTING FORCES

Message from C.I.O.

Mr. Philip Murray, President of the Congress of Industrial Organisations (C.I.O.) sends the following message, which was broadcast from London to Warsaw :

“Fighters of Warsaw, I am speaking to you on behalf of millions of workers organised in the Congress of Industrial Organisations who are at present working in vital war industries or fighting in armed forces on all theatres of war and taking part in all operations. I am speaking on behalf of men and women who contribute their share to the war effort and whose only aim is victory of the United Nations over the Forces of Nazis, Fascism and Japanese Imperialism. I am addressing you, workers and citizens of Warsaw, at the time when the third mass rising against the invader is taking place in your city. I am sure that the Allied military authorities will do the utmost to send you all possible help to enable you to free the capital from the German oppression. I would also like to assure you that the workers of America are well informed of your bitter struggle, and are watching with great admiration your heroism and devotion to the common cause of the United Nations. great and small ; you will be able again to enjoy freedom and independence, and that you will have a free and democratic Poland.”

MESSAGE FROM THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOUR

Mr. Robert Watt, the International Representative of the American Federation of Labour (A. F. L.) has sent the following message, which was broadcast from London to Warsaw on August 24th :

“None of the freedom-loving peoples of the world can overlook the indomitable spirit of the people of Warsaw. Out of the charred ruins, the destruction and rivers of its own blood, Warsaw is reborn, and stands again in undying struggle for freedom. Warsaw’s battles have more significance because the struggle for independence was always bound with the aims of freedom under the motto : “Poland for common people, freedom and justice.”

In 1794, Kosciuszko started the fire of freedom burning in Warsaw in the fighting against great odds. —the Czarist power, Prussia and Imperial Austria. At that time Kosciuszko who confronted with a shortage of guns and ammunition, and at that time scythes of the Cracovian peasants and the knives and stones of city workers were the weapons which predominated in the hands of the people’s army. The traditions of the immortal Kosciuszko have not died, they were reborn in the Warsaw insurrection of 1831 and again in 1863. The surprised world looked with amazement upon the heroic people who preferred to die standing and fighting than to live on their knees. The year 1905, the time of the first social revolution on the territory of the Russian Empire, the Warsaw workers fought against the Czarist Cossacks in the streets of the city, holding high the banner of freedom and justice. In the tragic and magnificent epics of Warsaw in 1939, when in the

eye of the world, during long and weary days of that bloody month, in flames of her burning houses, without necessary arms, she defended herself and the whole world against the flood of Nazi barbarism. Battalions of workers fought gloriously and unselfishly. Mieczyslaw Niedzalkowski, the Labour Leader who later was murdered by the German, together with T. Arciszewski and others, stood with heroic Mayor Starzynski, sending the workers' army into battle against Hitler's tanks and bombers. Again today Warsaw, starved by 5 years of war, destroyed and ill-treated in a most bestial way, stood up to fight. It started the uprising with the understanding of its London Government which is composed mostly of the representatives of organised peasants and labour. There is one thing certain that we cannot permit the heroic city, which so many times in history indicated to humanity with its own blood and life the road to freedom, to perish in this battle because she lacks ammunition. To-day when the victorious Allies freed Rome and stand at the gates of Paris, when the victorious Red Army is breaking through the borders of Germany and when Tokio is within firing range, there can be no overwhelming obstacle in the way of giving a helping hand when the workers of Warsaw despite tremendous difficulties give such a splendid account of themselves. We in America are deeply stirred. We salute you for your heroism. We send you our fraternal greetings. We wish we could say: "While we are not with you in Warsaw in a physical sense, you may rest assured that the Labour Movement of the United States is with you in spirit. May the tyrant's yoke soon be removed. Keep up the good fight."

American Labour Stands By The Atlantic Charter

By DAVID DUBINSKY, President, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union

We in the American labour movement traditionally have maintained a strong sympathy for minorities and small nations. In the open declaration of policy and in our public acts, we have invariably followed out the theory of equal rights and privileges for groups of all nations, creeds and nationalities. This may be due to the fact that our labour movement, as the economic organization of all wage-earners organically draws no lines between creeds and nationalities, and it may have been influenced by the fact that as part of America itself we are historically bound up with the philosophy of equality of all men.

This outlook and this philosophy of the labour movement are not exclusively American. From their very birth of labour movement in all countries with very few exceptions, have adhered in thought and practice to the principle that small nations have an inherent right to independence and cultural freedom within the frame of international framework. Our international federation of trade unions in various crafts and industries were set up as models of such world wide organisations within which major economic and social problems were to be deliberated upon and legislated

It is due to this social philosophy that our Trade Union leaders welcomed with such faith and enthusiasm the Wilson doctrine of self-determination of nations, large and small, and why Samuel Gomporka and his associates of that day laid such great store by it. If this doctrine and the international institutions which emerged at the end of the First World War failed, with the result that we have a Second World War, it surely was not the fault of the labour movement.

When President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill met on a battleship in the Atlantic in August, 1941, and gave the world the Atlantic Charter, labour throughout the world felt that the war had become overnight *something far greater than one of defence against the menace of Nazi aggression*. Labour felt that the war was now a crusade for a better kind of world, the world we have always believed in. *Labour, therefore, hailed the Atlantic Charter with enthusiasm.*

During the following two years that enthusiasm suffered a decline as we noted with disappointment that the promises of the Atlantic Charter were not being implemented into reality. Then came the Moscow meeting of the foreign secretaries of Russia, Britain and the United States, when labour's hopes were again renewed. As you will recall the Moscow Conference pledged the three powers to form a general international organisation for the preservation of peace after the war. The conference also stated that, pending its formation they would immediately set up a machinery for consultation on all subjects of mutual concern. They also specified that they would call in the smaller

nations whenever issues which concerned them would have to be decided.

Later came the meeting at Teheran of Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin, and everybody expected that out of that meeting would come the announcement of a step in the direction of creating such an international organization promised at Moscow. Unfortunately the announcement issued after the Teheran Conference said almost nothing about the organisation of peace after the war.

Since that time we have come to realize that, instead of moving to create a general international organization prescribed at Moscow to maintain the peace after the war, we are face to face with policies designed to establish spheres of influences in which the great and powerful nations can dominate militarily and politically.

And Secretary Hull's recent interpretation of the Atlantic Charter, while it was received with general favour and aroused hopes, does not contain enough assurance that our own disinterested policy as a member of the United Nations can prevail against facts accomplished today, while the struggle against the Axis enemies is still on. Said our Secretary of States : "The Atlantic Charter is only an expression of fundamental objectives. It points the direction in which solutions are to be sought ; it does not give solutions."

Does that mean that we are ready to drop the Atlantic Charter, the promises of the Moscow conference and the hopes that we entertained from the Teheran meeting ?

Does that mean that the policy of power, the policy of spheres of influence, the policy which permits a few

gigantic empires to absorb the smaller nations on the ground of "strategic security" is to prevail at the end of this World War?

Does it mean that the vision of a better organised world that labour saw when the Atlantic Charter was proclaimed is to be abandoned?

Does it mean that we are still adrift with regard to peace planning and peace organisation?

Or does that mean that, after having won the war, we are still likely to lose the peace?

There is one very important thing to bear in mind in attempting to answer these questions. The swallowing up of the smaller nations will not come by the consent of these small nations themselves. It could only be accomplished by force, against the will of the peoples concerned. The Nazis tried to accomplish this by the most brutal force, with what results? They could not organise Europe on the basis of swallowing up the smaller nations. And it means further that within the great empires that will absorb the smaller nations by force there will arise rebellions and insurrections against the dictatorships that will be imposed upon them. There will be no room left for democracy, no room for liberty, no room for national freedom.

What will inevitably follow is rivalry, jealousy and conflict between the big empires, such of them desiring still greater sphere of influence, wider domination over the smaller national units, in the various continents. This would indeed be a sad prospect, a sad conclusion to all the bloody sacrifices of this war. For such an outcome would present almost unavoidable danger of a Third World War.

American labour—the millions organized in the greatest sector of our national community—does not

welcome such a tragic prospect. American labour is fearful of the prospect of great empires controlling spheres of influences after the war, because it is convinced that this will never lead to permanent peace and stability. An unstable world and unstable Europe mean that the working masses the world over will never be able to form stable organizations to defend their standards of living. An unstable world means the continuous breakdown of labour organization ; it means misery and degradation for the wage-earners everywhere, including our own country.

Poland is a case we point out, Poland is a testing ground. Poland was the first of the United Nations to resist Nazi aggression. She fought bravely against the Nazis five years ago, and she is still fighting bravely today, both on the battlefield and underground.

The Atlantic Charter promised that she would not be victim of *any territorial mistreatment by any of her neighbours after the war*. It assured her that she alone—her people alone—would decide what kind of government they wanted to live under. Today Poland is faced with the probability that whether her people like it or not, a considerable part of her territory will be taken away from her by the Soviets. What is even worse, the promise is now made to her that she will be “compensated” by a large slice of eastern Germany. That means that Poland or what remains of her will become a centre of constant and bitter struggle after the war, a football which other nations so inclined will be able to toss around to achieve certain political objectives.

We hold no brief for the former government of Poland. Many of her former rulers were blind and reactionary. But it would be stark blindness to deny

that Poland's Government-in-exile representing as it does a cross-section of Poland itself, is composed of a majority of sincere democrats, many of them well-known leaders of the labour movement.

But regardless of what one may think of the Polish Government today or even of some anti-semitic elements of the old regime, there is one principle to which we must adhere, that the Poles and only the Poles must decide the personnel of their cabinets or ruling administration.

We cannot deny to Poland, as she is bravely struggling on our side in this great war for human rights, the same rights we accord ourselves and Great Britain, though very few will defend British policy in India, or British treatment of the Palestinian problem, with Britain's refusal to lift the irrigation bars in Palestine meaning death for countless thousands of Jewish people seeking escape from Hitler's charnel houses and gas chambers.

It is my conviction that the American labour movement—with the exception of a tiny minority who blindly follow the totalitarian angle—will stand up, together with the other free labour movements in Allied nations, in defence of the Atlantic Charter. And by that I mean not the interpretation of the Atlantic Charter to accommodate and appease certain elements in Britain as well as the “realists” in Soviet Russia.

No one will honestly charge the American Trade Unionists with enmity or jealousy toward Soviet Russia; no American Trade Unionist can honestly underrate the magnificent role of the Russian people and its armies in the common war we are waging on Nazism and its barbarities. But if it is “realism” we shall not be fooled by those who pay lip service to unity but in

reality hunger for power and domination of other peoples; by those who profess to believe in national rights and freedom for all small nations, but in reality follow the policies of narrow national interests and world power.

We of the labour movement who hailed the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms do not wish to see them emasculated and watered down to the point where neither friend nor enemy will be able to recognize their force and meaning.

As a great democracy, our strength in war and peace does not lie in appeasement—this we have learned from bitter experience in the past half a dozen years. Rather is our strength in the confidence and faith which the world may have in America as a land that believes in what it promises and acts accordingly.

We of the labour movement are for real democracy and real freedom.

That's why *we stand by the Atlantic Charter for all and every people on the face of the globe.* That's why we demand that it shall not be treated as a scrap of paper.

It is such scraps of paper which today incite national hostilities and tend to produce even more ghastly conflagrations tomorrow.

June. 1944.

From the official magazine of the American Labour Federation.

Poland And World Famed Socialists

In 1878 Karl Marx, the father and the greatest authority of all Socialists demanded the formation of :

"Not just any Poland, weak and helpless, which would be independent only on paper, but a strong State, really fit for independent existence and built on sound foundations. Poland must at least be given the territories she had before 1772." (*Neue Rheinische Zeitung*.)

Poland before 1772, it means the first partition had 301,080 sq. miles. By the Treaty of Riga she agreed to cede 151,088, it means more than a half to Russia, with one purpose in view—to secure a Lasting Peace, to exist free on absolutely indisputable territory.

In another article Karl Marx said of the Poles : "They help to *destroy the feudalism in Europe*," and "The reconstruction of a democratic Poland is the first condition of existence of democratic Germany."

Is it not strange to hear to-day from the followers and admirers of "Father" Marx, the ridiculous charges against "Polish Feudalism," when Poland was a country who never had any feudal period in her history ?

William Liebknecht, the famous German socialist, wrote in 1897 :

"Anybody who does not sympathize with the Poles and does not feel hatred and loathing for her murderers is either a fool or a false despicable hypo-

crete," ("Shall Europe become Cossack?" edited in 1897 in London, in English, German and Polish.)

Which of the two epithets—fool or hypocrite can be applied to-day to those engaged in anti-Polish propaganda?

The Council of People's Commissars on January 1920 declared:

1. "The Russian Socialist Federation of Soviet Republic has recognized and invariably recognizes, *without conditions and reservations*, the independence and sovereignty of the Polish Republic and bases all its relations on this recognition."

2. "Maintaining the last peace-proposals made to Poland, the Council of People's Commissars declare that the Red forces will not pass beyond the lines of the front running close to: Dryssa, Dzisna, Polock, Ptycz and on the Ukrainian front close to Cudnowa, Pilawa and Bar."

Signed—Lenin, Chincherin, Trotski.

The line proposed to Poland by the pillars of Communism in this declaration was 40 to 60 miles East of that adopted in Riga.

On May 12th, 1917 at the Conference of Social Democratic Party, Lenin said: "No one has oppressed the Poles as much as have the Russian people, serving in the hands of the Tsars as the executioners of Polish freedom. Why should we, who have been oppressing a greater number of nations than any other people, repudiate the right of separation for Poland, Finland and Ukraine. We say that the boundaries are determined by the will of the population. The Proletariat must not resort to force, for it must not interfere with the freedom of people."

Who is now betraying the noble principles of the true socialists of Russia and returning to the old grooves of the oppressive Tsarist policy and methods?

On August 1918 the Council of People's Commissars abrogated all the former treaties with Germany and Austria concerning the partitions of Poland, recognizing thereby fully Poland's rights to her former pre-partition territories, it means 301,080 sq. miles, and not 151,038.

In Article 3 of the Treaty of Riga we read:

"Russia and Ukraine abandon all rights and claims to the territories situated to the west of the frontier laid down by Article 2."

Are not these obligations thrown now to the winds?

And Mr. Joffe, Chief of the Soviet Delegation in Riga said after the signature of the Treaty: ". . . the atmosphere of these conversations invariably favourable, facilitated the conclusion of a satisfactory agreement." ". . . None of our treaties leaves any problem unsolved, or solved merely on the basis of the relative strength of the contracting parties. We have concluded a peace-treaty giving satisfaction to the vital, legitimate and necessary interests of the Polish nation."

Can one read in these the implication,—which is now used in the anti-Polish campaign—that a strong, victorious Poland compelled a weak, defeated Russia to accept a treaty against her wish and interests? Is it not grotesque if not ridiculous to speak about "powerful" Poland when she was just beginning the reorganization of her independent State and of "weak" Russia with all her tremendous manpower and resources?

The Soviet's Great Encyclopaedia of 1940 writes :

"In March the peace treaty was signed. However the new Polish-Soviet frontier meant for Poles much worse conditions in comparison to those which the Soviet Government suggested in April 1920," this ran 50-100 kilometers west of, the line finally adopted.

Is it not easy to deduce from these words and documents, that the actual claims of Russia are :

- (1) against all her former treaties and obligations ;
- (2) against all the "vital, legitimate and necessary interests" of Poland, recognized by Russian leaders and governing bodies ;
- (3) against all socialist traditions and principles ;
- (4) against all Poland's right for self-determination, hence against the Freedom of Europe and the Atlantic Charter.

POLAND A TEST CASE FOR DEMOCRACY

By Camille Huysmans

Any one who has the fate of the smaller nations at heart and who disagrees in principle with the European set-up of a Western and Eastern sphere of interest, instead of a collective security system which will never allow Germany to play one against the other, must be deeply disquietted.

Neither the Government in London, whatever its composition may be, nor the Polish Committee of National Liberation should reach any definite settlement of all major questions without consultation with the Polish people.

We, European Democrats and Socialists refuse to believe that decisions of such magnitude should be made over the heads of the very people who would have to live to bear the consequences.

We, therefore, demand that Poland as well as Czechoslovakia, Belgium as well as Holland, be trusted right from the beginning as independent States joining a collective system of security and bearing their natural share in preserving the world's peace.

Peace, Mr. Litvinov once stated, is indivisible, for the great as well as for the small powers and indivisible it should be.

—From *Time and Tide*, Aug. 1944.

The University Library,

ALLAHABAD.

Accession No. — 10353 *J2*
85525

Section No. — 9510
221

(Form No 28-L 5000-43)